

Brāhmaṇa,⁴ the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,⁵ the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*⁶ and the *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra*.⁷ (Of these, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* alone has the imperative version;⁸ the others have *asi*.) Is there any evidence to suggest which of these was the Buddha's source? (Or the source of the Buddhist author, if we hesitate to ascribe authorship to the Buddha.) Since my article showed a reference in the AS to *Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad I* and the *Brhadāraṇyaka* constitutes the last part of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the latter must be the strongest candidate. Moreover, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is generally assigned to the relatively eastern part of Vedic India where the Buddha preached. Acquaintance with one Vedic text or tradition would of course not disprove acquaintance with others too. In my article I drew attention to a relationship between AS para. 22 and the *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra*, though in that case the brahminical text shows awareness of Buddhists.

It is in the very next sentence after the one giving this etymology of *khattiya* that the word *rājā* is derived from the phrase *dhammena pare rañjeti*, "he pleases others by righteousness". This new discovery bolsters my contention that that was intended as a joke.

Oxford

Richard Gombrich

⁴ 1,7,8,5. *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, ed. Rājendralāla Mitra, *Bibliotheca Indica* 125, Calcutta 1859, Vol. I, p. 149.

⁵ 5,4,2,2. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* [Mādhyandina recension], ed. Albrecht Weber, Berlin 1855, p. 460.

⁶ 12,11. *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. W. Caland, *Bibliotheca Indica* 1196, Vol. 2, fascicle 2, Calcutta 1908, p. 101,17.

⁷ 18,16,6. *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. R. Garbe, Calcutta 1902, Vol. III, p. 96,2.

⁸ No Pali equivalent of the imperative form *edhi* exists. This could conceivably be why the phrase in the AS has no verb, but I doubt that it is relevant.

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES X¹

TWO PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here are two more words which are either omitted from PED,² or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *samā* "year"

PED gives two meanings for *samā*: "year" (< Skt *samā*) and "pyre" in *agginisamā* (Sn 668 670). The second of these seems to be an error, since it is more likely to be the word *sama* "like". For the first meaning PED quotes Dhp 106 and Mhv VII 74 (misprinted as 78). It also occurs in the latter text at II 30, III 1 and V 120 (and probably elsewhere). Dhp-a seems to understand the meaning correctly, since it glosses: *yo yajetha satam saman ti yo vassasatam māse māse sahassam pariccajanto lokiyanahājanassa dānam dadeyya* (II 231,8–10), although the interpretation was probably helped by the presence of *vassasatam hutam* later in the same verse. There seems to be no doubt about the meaning in Mhv-t. At Mhv-t 137,25 (ad Mhv II 30) *samā* is glossed *samvaccharā*, at 215,25 (ad Mhv V 120) *aṭṭhārasasamo* is glossed *aṭṭhārasavassiko*, and at 267,12 (ad Mhv VII 74) *samā khalu aṭṭhatimśā* is glossed *aṭṭhatimś' eva samvacchare*. At 140,20–21 (ad Mhv III 1) the word is not glossed, but the cty clearly understands the structure of the compound (misleadingly divided in Mhv) and the word crasis, since it glosses: *pañcacattālīsamāsamo ti ettha hi pañcacattālīsamā asamo ti padacchedo hoti*.

¹ See K.R. Norman, "Pāli Lexicographical Studies IX", in *JPTS*, XVI, pp.77–85.

² Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli and Sanskrit texts are as in the Epilogomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*; Skt = Sanskrit; cty/cties = commentary/ commentaries.

At Dhp 106 we find *samam* in apposition to *satam* “one hundred years”, although it is not easy to analyse the form, since *samam* appears to be singular. In BHS at Udāna-v XXIVb (and elsewhere) we find the compound *samāsatam*. This suggests that the original form in Dhp 106 was *samāsatam*, which developed to *samamsatam* by the common alternation of a long vowel and a short nasalised vowel. This compound was probably assumed to consist of two separate words *samam satam*, both apparently accusative singular forms, which could therefore be recited/written in the reverse order, since the scansion was the same either way.

We must presume that the fact that *samam* seems to be singular did not worry the tradition. This makes the inability of the commentarial tradition to understand the phrase *sassatisamam* (< Skt *śāsvatīḥ samāḥ*) at D I 14,14 foll. all the more strange. It appears in form to be an accusative singular used as an adverb “for eternal year(s)”, and Rhys Davids translates “(they are) for ever and ever”.³ The commentary, however, takes *sama* to mean “the same”: *atthi tv eva sassatisaman ti ettha sassatī ti niccaṃ vijjamānatāya mahāpaṭhavī maññati, tathā Sineru-pabbata-canda-suriye, tato tehi samam attānam maññamāno* “*atthi tv eva sassati-saman*” *ti vadati* (Sv 105,26–29). This is translatable: “They remain the same, just like eternity itself”.⁴ A comparable explanation is given at Ps I 71,13–16 (ad M I 8,26): *sassatisaman ti canda-suriya-samudda-mahāpaṭhavī-pabbatā lokavohārena sassatiyo ti vuccanti. sassatīhi samam sassatisamam. yāva sassatiyo tiṭṭhanti tāva tath’ eva thassatī ti gaṇhato evam ditṭhi hoti*. Similarly, Spk II 324,16–17 (ad S III 143,17): *sassati-saman ti Sineru-mahāpaṭhavī-candima-suriyādīhi sassatīhi samam*.

³ *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, p. 28.

⁴ Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The all-embracing net of views*, Kandy 1978, p. 140.

The word also occurs in the historically correct form *sassatī samā* at Vv V:13:14 (= Vv-a 264,10*, where it is printed as one word *sassatisamā*). That the tradition did not understand this form is shown by the explanation: *sassatisamā ti kulaparamparāya sassatīhi candasuriyādīhi samānā. te pi acirakālappattakulanvayā ti attho* (Vv-a 265,8–10), where it would appear that *sama* is also taken in the sense of “like”, and *sassatisamā* (which the metre requires) is taken as a compound “like the eternal (things)”. It is translated by Masefield as “eternal-like”.⁵ Similarly Ja III 256,4–6’ (ad 255,22*, where it is printed as one word): *sassatīsamā ti sassatīhi paṭhavipabbatādīhi samam attānam maññamānā attano vassasahassaparimānam āyum apūretvā pi antarā va natīthā ti attho*.

The correct interpretation is as *sassatī samā*, two separate words, in the accusative plural, as the accusative of duration of time: “For eternal years”. It is possible that the cty believed that this was a tatpuruṣa compound “equal to eternal (things)”, in agreement with a plural subject. This belief led to a shortening of the -ī of *sassatī* in compound, and then the subsequent change to a singular form: “(they exist) for that (time ?) which is equal to the eternal things”.

2. *dvatīhi* “62”

At D I 54,4 Makkhali-Gosāla states: *dvatīhi paṭipadā*. Sv 162,9 explains: *dvatīhi paṭipadā ti dvāsaṭṭhi paṭipadā ti vadati*. Sv-pter I 290,2 explains: *dvāsaṭṭhi paṭipadā ti vattabbe sabhāvaniruttim ajānanto dvatīhi paṭipadā ti vadanti*. Bhikkhu Bodhi translates⁶: “Not knowing the natural language correctly he speaks of sixty-two pathways as *dvatīhi paṭipadā* when it should be *dvāsaṭṭhi paṭipadā*”.

⁵ P. Masefield, *Vimāna Stories*, Oxford 1989, p. 402.

⁶ Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The discourse on the fruits of recluseship*, Kandy, 1989, p. 73.

PED lists the form (s.v. *dvi*) but offers no explanation or etymology. It seems to be the only numeral in Pāli in the 61–69 range which does not have *-s-*.⁷ We can compare it with Pkt *sattatthi* (= *sattasatthi*) “67” which shows the same loss of intervocalic *-s-*, doubtless after its development to *-h-*.

Since the other statements in this teacher’s doctrines include nominative singular forms in *-e*, and the emphatic form *hevam*, which are both non-Pāli (Eastern) forms,⁸ it seems very likely that *dvatthi* is also a non-Pāli form. The *tikā*’s comment is of great interest, because it shows that the author of the *tikā* recognised that *dvatthi* belonged to a dialect other than Pāli.

Cambridge

K.R. Norman

⁷ See K.R.Norman, “Numerals in Middle Indo-Aryan”, in J. Gvozdanović (ed.): *Indo-European Numerals*, Amsterdam 1992, pp. 199–241 (p. 218).

⁸ See K.R. Norman, “Pāli lexicographical studies IX”, *JPTS* XVI, 1992, pp. 77–85 (p. 85)